

En Banc

Vol. 4, No. 2
October 1999

Newsletter of the Superior Court Law Library

INSIDE:

<i>Law Library News</i>	1
<i>National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week</i>	1
<i>Library Staff</i>	1
<i>Continuing Legal Education</i>	1
<i>Superior Court Update</i>	2
<i>Judge Edward Burke</i>	2
<i>Did You Know?</i>	2
<i>Electronic Resources</i>	2
<i>Internet Site Reviews</i>	2
<i>Publications of Interest on the Internet</i> ..	3
<i>In the Courts</i>	3
<i>Recent Arizona Cases</i>	3
<i>From Other Jurisdictions</i>	3
<i>New in the Library</i>	5
<i>Book Reviews</i>	5
<i>Article Reviews</i>	5
<i>Recently Received Books</i>	6
<i>Recent Articles: Courts and Court Administration</i>	6
<i>Recent Articles: Juries</i>	7
<i>"Did You Know?" Answers</i>	8
<i>Contributors</i>	8

Law Library News

❑ National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week

November 14th through 20th is National Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week. A recent story in the *Arizona Republic* indicated that "thousands in Arizona go hungry" and that the situation is getting worse. To help, the Maricopa County Bar Association's Young Lawyers Division Committee on Hunger and Homelessness, the Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness, and the Association of Arizona Food Banks are sponsoring a food drive.

The Law Library will be a drop-off location for donations of canned goods and non-perishable food. A local food bank will then pick up the donations for distribution to the community. Please drop off your donations in the boxes marked "Food Drive," located on the plaza level of the Library.

❑ Library Staff

Jeff Cobb recently joined our staff as a Law Library Aide. Jeff was born and raised in Arizona and graduated from North Canyon High School in 1995. He earned an AA degree from Paradise Valley Community College and currently attends ASU West where he is majoring in Justice Studies with a minor in politics.

Jeff's hobbies include watching and playing sports. He is also a big Star Wars fan and has spent more money, than he'd even like to think about on posters and toys. He also collects World War II soldiers made by G.I. Joe, Century Toys and Dragon.

Sandra Perez is our second newest Law Library Aide. Sandra is a native of Arizona and enjoys cooking and reading. She is attending ASU West where she is working on her bachelor's degree in Administration of Justice. Sandra would like to pursue a career as a crime scene photographer.

Continuing Legal Education

The Rules of Evidence in Family Law, which is being sponsored by Maricopa County Bar Association, will be presented on Thursday, November 18th from 1:30 to 5:00 P.M. The faculty includes Honorable Crane McClennen, Family Law Judge for the Superior Court in Maricopa County; Commissioner Leah Pallin-Hill, Family Law Commissioner for the Superior Court in Maricopa County; Honorable Nancy Smith, Family Law Judge Pro-Tem for the Superior Court in Maricopa County; Don Kessler, an attorney with the law firm of Ulrich, Kessler & Anger; and Jennifer Gadow, a family law practitioner with Cohen and Fromm. The attendants of this seminar, which will be held at the Holiday Inn Conference Center, will earn up to 3.5 hours of continuing education credit.

The Maricopa County Bar Association will present *Protecting Trade Secrets and Confidential Information* on Friday, November 19. This seminar will take place at Arizona State University's Downtown Center at the Mercado from 2:30 to 4:30 P.M. Maria Nutille and Heidi Richter of the Snell and Wilmer law firm will be leading a discussion of the use of agreements and the appropriate procedures to protect your company's proprietary information, customer relations and

En Banc

Newsletter of the
Superior Court Law Library

Superior Court Law Library
101 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona
85003

(602)506-3945 (phone)
(602)506-3677 (fax)

services@smtpgw.maricopa.gov

good will using restrictive covenants. The attendants will receive up to 2 hours of MCLE credit.

The State Bar of Arizona will be sponsoring *An Ethical Afternoon at the Movies* on December 8 from 1:30 until 4:45 at the Orange Tree Golf Resort. The Bar encourages all criminal and civil litigators to attend.

The topic of this seminar is conflicts of interest, of which the Bar says "half of the lawyers don't understand it - the other half just doesn't get it." The rules that define conflict of interest are baffling and "the case law is often, in a word, conflicting." This seminar, which may qualify for up to 3 hours of ethics, will feature film clips and a "smart but funny panel."

Superior Court Update

□ Judge Edward Burke

The investiture ceremony for Judge Edward Burke was held on July 21, 1999. He was appointed to fill the vacancy left when Judge Nastro retired. Judge Burke was born and raised in Syracuse, New York and moved to Phoenix in 1969. His educational accomplishments include a degree in political science from the State University of New York, a J.D. from the College of Law at Syracuse University as well as a Masters Degree in Business Administration from Arizona State University.

Judge Burke began his legal career as assistant corporation counsel for the City of Syracuse. When he moved to Arizona, he entered private practice with the firm of Rawlins, Ellis, Burrus & Kiewit. He was a founding partner of Norton, Burke, Berry & French. Prior to his appointment to the bench, Judge Burke as a partner with the Scottsdale law firm of Bennett, Burke, Carmichael & Kennedy.

Judge Burke has held numerous memberships and chairman positions with both legal and civic organizations, including the Municipal Aeronautics Advisory Board of the City of Phoenix and the Lawyer Referral Committee of the Maricopa County Bar Association. He is currently a member of the Thurgood Marshall Inn of Court.

Judge Burke served as a judge pro-tem for both the Arizona Court of Appeals and the Superior Court in Maricopa County. He is entering his 28th year as an athletic official in football, ice hockey and football.

Judge Burke is located in the Old Courthouse on the ground floor and is assigned to a civil calendar. The judge lives in Phoenix with his wife who the Associate Dean of the University Honors College at Arizona State University. Judge Burke and his wife have five children.

Did You Know?

Find out how much you actually know about our legal system. Answers are on the last page of this issue.

1. Which five baseball managers in this century have held law degrees?
2. In which of the following places did law students Bill Clinton and Hillary Rodham meet: contracts class, the Yale Democratic Club, the Yale Law Library?
3. What board game rewards you for achieving an illegal restraint of trade?
4. What do these famous lawyers have in common: Patrick Henry, John Jay, Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, and J. Strom Thurmond?
5. When the Library of Congress was largely destroyed during the War of 1812, what lawyer sold his library to rebuild the collection: Daniel Webster, William Blackstone, John Marshall, or Thomas Jefferson?

Electronic Resources

□ Internet Site Reviews

Judicial Statistical Inquiry Form

<http://teddy.law.cornell.edu:8090/questata.htm>

This site allows users to compile statistics on over 4.2 million Federal District court cases terminated between 1978 and 1997. Users may also search against state court materials comprising of "about 30 thousand state tort, contract, and real property cases terminated during fiscal 1992 in the general jurisdiction trial court of 45 of the nation's most populous counties."

Users may search the database by "subject matter category (such as branches of tort, contract, civil rights, and other areas of law), the jurisdictional basis, the amount demanded, the case's origin in the district as original or removed or transferred, the dates of filing and termination in the district, the procedural stage of the case at termination (including whether it was tried by judge or jury), the procedural method of disposition, and, when a judgment was entered, who prevailed and any amount awarded in damages or other relief."

This is an excellent web site for anyone who needs to do research on how cases have been decided in the federal court system. It is unfortunate that the database is no longer growing, but still offers users some valuable information.

☐ Publications of Interest on the Internet

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Civil Cases: Report of the Task Force on the Quality of Justice, Subcommittee on ADR and the Judicial System.

www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/adrreport.pdf

In 1998 California Chief Justice Ronald M. George appointed 20 members to the Subcommittee on ADR and the Judicial System. Their charge was to study some of the issues associated with ADR and to make recommendations on how the courts could best utilize ADR.

Some of the issues the subcommittee looked at included: the effects of ADR on courts; who may adopt ethical standards governing arbitrators; what ethical standards should be adopted; and the standards governing court referral of disputes to private judges or attorneys.

This report takes an in-depth look at each one of these issues, and makes some recommendations as to how the California courts can use ADR more effectively. Some of the recommendations: create a list of ADR neutrals to whom the court can refer potential litigants; enhance the provisions for enforcing agreements; develop an education program for judges and court staff on the effective use of ADR; and develop ethical standards for mediators.

The report is comprehensive and includes numerous appendices such as sample ethical standards, a new judicial canon of ethics, survey results, and some testimony offered at public hearings. At over 240 pages, this report cannot be considered light reading. However, there is an excellent executive summary that clearly outlines the main points and recommendations of the report. Anyone who is involved in developing a court mediation program or improving the

use of ADR in the courts would benefit from taking a look at this comprehensive resource.

In the Courts

☐ Recent Arizona Cases

State v. Jones and Tyrus, No. 1CA-CR 99-0087, 1CA-CR 99-0088 (1999)

***State v. Thomas* 301 Ariz. Adv. Rep. 3 (1999)**

In these two cases, both divisions of the Arizona Court of Appeals have ruled that first-time drug offenders cannot be incarcerated for a violation of intensive probation.

In the consolidated *Jones and Tyrus* case, as well as the *Thomas* case, each defendant was found to have violated the terms of intensive probation after being found guilty of drug offenses. Thomas's probation was revoked and he was sentenced to a 2 ½ year prison term which he timely appealed. In the *Jones and Tyrus* case, the State appealed the trial court's ruling not to sentence the defendants to prison for the violation.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court in *Jones and Tyrus* and overturned the *Thomas* case. In both cases, the appellate court said the voter-enacted Drug and Medicalization, Prevention and Control Act of 1996 "made it clear that drug offenders were not to do time in prison after a first or second conviction."

Division Two made its ruling first and after ascertaining the "electorate's intent" in approving Proposition 200, stated that "courts may not circumvent the mandate of the Act but only alter or add conditions of probation."

Division One reached the same conclusion and wrote that its "confidence in that conclusion is bolstered by the fact that Division Two of this court recently reached the same conclusion..."

Lindquist v. Hart, No. 1 CA-CV 98-0323 (1999)

In December of 1998, the Court of Appeals ruled that the Arizona Mobile Home Park Residential Landlord Tenant Act, A.R.S. 33-1401 *et. seq.*, did not require park operators to justify evictions of month-to-month tenants. The ruling "shocked" tenants' rights advocates and a motion for reconsideration was filed.

The case involved a mobile home park in Flagstaff. The tenants, the Lindquists, entered into a one-year lease and after its expiration they choose not to renew it and became month-to-month tenants.

In its December opinion the court ruled that "under the plain language of the statute, good cause for termination is required only if there is a rental agreement in existence." Further, it is well settled that in a "month-to-month" agreement, the tenancy ends and recommences at the end of each month.

Upon reconsideration, the appellate court ruled that good cause must be shown to terminate a month-to-month tenancy and said the new ruling "is in harmony with the spirit of the act." The law was designed to give some stability to the tenants of mobile home parks because of the high cost associated with moving mobile homes.

The defendants-appellants now contend that the issue must be resolved by the Arizona Supreme Court and have filed a petition for review.

☐ From Other Jurisdictions

B.C. v. Plumas Unified School District, No. 97-17287 (9th Cir., 1999)

The 9th Circuit has upheld the rights of students against random searches by drug-sniffing dogs by ruling that such a search is an "unreasonable violation of Fourth Amendment protections."

In 1996, students at Quincy High School were told to wait outside a classroom while dogs sniffed backpacks, jackets, and other belongings left in the room. As the students were leaving the classroom, one of the dogs "alerted" its handler to one particular student. After the classroom search and as the students returned, the dog once again alerted the sheriff to the same student. The student was taken away and searched. No drugs were found on the student or in the high school that day.

In its opinion, the court wrote that "[T]here can be no dispute that deterring drug use by students is an important - if not compelling - government interest." But absent a drug crisis in the high school, the random and suspicion less search was unreasonable given the circumstances.

***Lambright v. Stewart and Smith v. Stewart*, Nos. 96-99020 (9th Cir., 1999)**

In a case that has received much attention in several legal newspapers, the 9th Circuit has ruled 10-1 that "there is no per se constitutional error in trying two defendants before two juries in the same courtroom."

Agreeing that the use of dual juries is experimental, Scott Bales, Solicitor General for the State of Arizona said, "[A] dual jury allows you to avoid some of the inefficiency and delay that come from separate trials, but gives each defendant a jury that will only hear evidence admissible to that defendant." But in a dissenting opinion, Judge Stephen Reinhardt described the use of dual juries by saying "to conduct unauthorized experiments in capital cases is to demonstrate a disdain for human life."

The defendants in this case were charged with the kidnap, rape and

murder of Sandy Owen. Each defendant eventually confessed, implicating the other. The trial court ordered two juries and although both juries would hear some of the same evidence, each jury was also excused when testimony about the other defendant was presented. Both Lambright and Smith were ultimately convicted of first-degree murder and sentenced to death.

In its opinion, the 9th Circuit said that "trial judges have inherent power and discretion to adopt special, individualized procedures designed to promote the ends of justice in each case that comes before them." In ordering a dual jury in this case, the trial judge did not exceed his authority. In fact, the court continued, "many experiments lead to better and stronger institutions."

***State v. Ferguson*, No. 03-S-01-9803-CR-00029 (Supreme Court of Tennessee, 1999).**

The main question presented to the court in this case was "what are the factors which should guide the determination of the consequences that flow from the State's loss or destruction of evidence which the accused contends would be exculpatory?"

The defendant, Ferguson, was found on a freeway ramp slumped over the steering wheel of his van. When a city police officer opened the door to Ferguson's vehicle, he detected a strong odor of alcohol and noted that the defendant's speech was slurred. A field sobriety test was conducted and the defendant was subsequently arrested. Upon his arrival at the police station, additional tests were conducted and videotaped. Later, however, the videotape was inadvertently taped over.

At trial, the defendant presented a medical expert to support his defense that he suffered from "vascular or migraine-type headaches that included scotoma which affected his vision and coordination." He argued

that the police acted in bad faith by not preserving the evidence that he contends would have proved his innocence.

The United States Supreme Court's leading opinion on this issue - lost or destroyed evidence - is *Arizona v. Youngblood*, 488 U.S. 51, 109 S.Ct. 333, 102 L.Ed. 2d 281 (1988). In *Youngblood* the high court ruled that "unless a criminal defendant can show bad faith on the part of the police, failure to preserve potentially useful evidence does not constitute denial of due process of law."

The Tennessee Supreme Court has rejected the United States Supreme Court's holding in *Youngblood* as have a number of other states. The Tennessee court is quoted as saying "that the due process principles of the Tennessee Constitution are broader than those enunciated in the United States Constitution." According to an article in the October 4th edition of *Lawyers Weekly USA*, "many experts predict that the trend of states providing greater protection to defendants than the U.S. Supreme Court is likely to continue."

The Tennessee Court, instead, applied a "balancing approach." Once the court determined that the State had a duty to preserve the evidence the court then looked at "the degree of negligence involved...the significance of the destroyed evidence... and the sufficiency of the other evidence used at trial to support the conviction." After careful consideration, the court concluded that the defendant received a fair trial and that he "experienced no measurable disadvantage" because of the lost evidence.

Although the defendant's conviction was upheld, the court ruled that by applying the *Youngblood* analysis, it "substantially increases the defendant's burden while reducing the prosecution's burden at the expense of the defendant's fundamental right to a fair trial."

In re the Marriage of Kohring, No. 81139 (Supreme Court of Missouri, 1999)

The Supreme Court of Missouri has upheld the constitutionality of that state's child support statute which permits awards for college expenses. Missouri statute §452.340.5 specifically states that the "...parental support obligation shall continue, if the child continues to attend and progresses toward completion of said program, until the child completes such program or reaches age twenty-one, whichever first occurs."

The parties were divorced in 1989 and upon a subsequent child support modification hearing, the appellant was ordered to pay \$900.00 a month for the support of the couple's two children. In 1997, when the daughter applied to the University of Missouri-Columbia, the mother petitioned the court to once again modify the appellant's financial obligation. The father, in turn, filed a motion to dismiss the mother's petition along with a cross-motion to terminate the child support for the college-bound daughter. The trial court overturned the father's petitions and ordered him to pay 80% of the daughter's college expenses.

The father argued that the statute "burdens a previously unrecognized suspect class of unmarried, divorced, or legally separated parents and imposes on them a monetary obligation that does not exist for married parents."

In its ruling, the court said that "the state has a legitimate interest in securing higher education opportunities for children from broken homes."

New in the Library

□ Book Reviews

Ostrom, Brian J. and Roger A. Hanson. *Efficiency, Timeliness,*

and Quality: A New Perspective from Nine State Criminal Trial Courts. National Center for State Courts, 1999. KF 8727 .O88 1999

Researchers at the National Center for State Courts and the American Prosecutors Research Institute examined nine criminal trial court systems, looking at the pace of the criminal trial process and the balance between time and other considerations such as due process, protection against double jeopardy, and excessive bail. At the end of the study, the authors note, the basic challenge confronting the criminal justice system remains: "Is it possible to resolve cases expeditiously without sacrificing the quality of justice?"

The study looked at trial courts in Albuquerque, Birmingham, Cincinnati, Grand Rapids, Hackensack, Oakland, Sacramento, Austin, and Portland. Some of the questions raised by the study include: What do the nine criminal court systems look like? Why are some felony cases resolved faster than others? Is there a local legal culture that fosters timeliness and quality?

The study measured the timeliness of trials in each court by counting the number of days from indictment or bindover to final resolution. The quality of case processing was measured using Standard 3.3 of the *Trial Court Performance Standards* to "develop a measure of case processing quality that relates directly to timeliness." The authors conclude that "the evidence from this study suggests that well-performing courts should be expected to excel in terms of both timeliness and quality."

A description is included of each court's environment, organization, staffing, and felony adjudication process. An appendix lists the questions asked of prosecutors and defense attorneys in each of the nine courts.

□ Article Reviews

Seltzer, Richard. "The Vanishing

Juror: Why Are There Not Enough Available Jurors?" 20 Justice System Journal 203 (1999).

A recent study of the jury system of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, showed that only "18 percent of potential jurors actually serve." Nationally, the juror no-show percentage stands at about 55 percent. Working with the nonprofit organization, Council for Court Excellence; a Washington, D.C. jury project concluded that "the court should consider other positive, nonmonetary inducements" to deal with its problem of juror nonresponse.

The study cited four main reasons why people evade jury duty. Money is the number one reason for juror no-shows. Lost wages and low jury fees discourage potential jurors. Other factors include lengthy trials and long, boring waits in "noisy, crowded, unclean, and inconvenient to transportation" courthouses. Disbelief in the justice system was the third finding of the project followed by yet another disbelief - that jurors who fail to show will not even be punished.

The study was constructed in five parts. In each part, the objectives were stated followed by the methodology used. In one part, for example, the intention of the study was to determine why 150 potential juror questionnaires were returned as "undeliverable." The decision was to make "one-to-one" contact with each juror. The study group used phone books, directory assistance, criss-cross directories and credit reports to find current addresses. Once contacted, the jurors were interviewed and asked for their thoughts about jury duty and what, other than a current address, might get them to respond in the future. Likewise, those who did serve on juries were interviewed about their experience as well as their thoughts about what improvements might be made.

The interviews and results showed

that the "focus group kept coming back to the theme of 'make it positive'." The committee concluded that juror empowerment and education were the first steps in affecting such a change. When jurors understand, though education, how important their service is they become empowered and show an increased rate of participation in the process. The committee recommends that motor vehicle and voter registration lists be cleaned up but admits it is not sure how best to accomplish this. Further, the jury project says that courts should be responsible for educating citizens about the importance of jury duty and what impact their service can have on the justice system.

☐ Recently Received Books

Aids & The Criminal Justice System: Dealing with HIV-Positive Clients and Other Issues

The County
ARIZ KFA2757.8.A35 A25 1993

Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Handbook for Judges

American Bar Association
KF9084 .A97 1987

Arizona DUI Trial Book

State Bar of Arizona
KFA2497.8.A9 A75 1999

California Marital Settlement & Other Family Law Agreements, 2nd ed.

California CEB
KFC126.A65 C352

California Durable Powers of Attorney

California CEB
KFC336 .C352

Clifford, Denis

Estate Planning Basics: What You Need to Know and Nothing More

Nolo Press
PLAZA KF750.Z9 C585 1999

Family Violence: A Model State Code

National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges
KF505.5 .F355 1992

Gima, Patricia

The Trademark Registration Kit

Nolo Press
PLAZA KF3181.Z9 G56 1999

A Handbook of Jury Research

ALI-ABA
KF8972 .H35 1999

Mancuso, Anthony

Your Limited Liability Company

Nolo Press
PLAZA KF1380.Z9 M364 1999

Ostrom, Brian J.

Efficiency, Timeliness, and Quality: A New Perspective from Nine State Criminal Trial Courts

National Center for State Courts
KF8727 .O88 1999

Pease, Ken

Uses of Criminal Statistics

Ashgate Publishing
HV6024.5 .U69 1999

Peer Justice and Youth

Empowerment: An Implementation Guide for Teen Court Programs
National Criminal Justice Reference Service
KF9795.A1 G63 1998

Radnor, Alan T.

Cross-Examining Doctors: A Practical Guide

ALI-ABA
KF8964 .R33 1999

Under Construction

American Bar Association Forum on the Construction Industry
KF297.C55 U6

Universal Citation Guide

American Association of Law Libraries, Committee on Citation Formats
REF KF245 .U58 1999

☐ Recent Articles: Courts and Court Administration

Armstrong, Jason W. "Man Sentenced for Threatening Judge." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 2 (August 25, 1999).

Bartlett, Lauren. "County Can Be Sued for Death at Courthouse: Appeals Panel Rules That Lack of Security Could Create Risk." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 1 (July 22, 1999).

Beckman, David and David Hirsch. "Paper Glitches in Digital Courthouses." 85 *ABA Journal* 85 (August 1999).

"Civil Suit Plaintiffs Win More Than Half of Cases." *Arizona Republic* A19 (September 6, 1999).

Cross, Frank B. "The Judiciary and Public Choice." 50 *Hastings Law Journal* 355 (1999).

Fimea, Mike. "Drug Court Is a Winner." 119 *Arizona Business*

Gazette 1 (July 22, 1999).

Firestone, David. "Judges' Conference on Death Penalty Has Defense Lawyers in an Uproar." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 4 (August 19, 1999).

Fischer, Howard. "State High Court Eyeing Limits on Jury Challenges." *Mesa Tribune* A6 (July 30, 1999).

Greene, J. Thomas. "A Kinder, Gentler Justice System." 39 *Judges' Journal* 22 (September 1999).

Hart, Jordana. "Lawsuit Says Men Face Bias in Courts." *Boston Globe* B3 (September 8, 1999).

"Judge Accused of Literally Giving Lawyer the Finger." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 5 (July 21, 1999).

Kilpatrick, James J. "Is the U.S. Supreme Court Doing Enough Work?" *Tulsa World* 18 (September 4, 1999).

Lance, Al. "Circuit Court Should Be Smaller, More Efficient." *Idaho Statesman* 6B (September 8, 1999).

Lawrence, Curtis. "Chief Judge Proposes Separate Court Clinic." *Chicago Sun-Times* 19 (August 24, 1999).

MacLean, Pamela A. "Judges Are Seeking Guidance on Problem of Holdout Jurors." 5 *Arizona Journal* 2 (July 19, 1999).

Marlowe, Douglas B. and Kimberly C. Kirby. "Effective Use of Sanctions in Drug Courts: Lessons From Behavioral Research." 2 *National Drug Court Institute Review* 1 (Summer 1999).

McBeth, Honorable Veronica S. "Judicial Outreach Initiatives." 62 *Albany Law Review* 1379 (1999).

McGavin, Gregor. "Volunteer Interpreters Guide People Through Court Maze." *Arizona Republic* B3

(September 10, 1999).

Mitchell, Greg. "Calif. Mulls Insurance for Judges." 21 *National Law Journal* A6 (July 26, 1999).

O'Connor, Justice Sandra Day. "Room for Improvement: The U.S. Supreme Court Justice Outlines Areas of Reform for the Nation's Courts." 28 *Student Lawyer* 22 (September 1999).

Rock, Vickie. "Securing the Courthouse: The Conversion to Digital Documents." 7 *Lawyers Competitive Edge* 3 (July 1999).

Smith, M.B.E. "May Judges Ever Nullify the Law?" 74 *Notre Dame Law Review* 1657 (June 1999).

Traylor, John. "Ada County's Child Care Program for Parent-Jurors." 14 *Court Manager* 52 (1999).

Weisberg, Jodi. "Disagreements Continue Over Maricopa Superior Court 'Crisis'." 5 *Arizona Journal* 1 (August 2, 1999).

Weisberg, Jodi. "Hull's Record on Appointing Minority Judges Questioned." 5 *Arizona Journal* 1 (August 23, 1999).

White, Penny J. "Judicial Independence: Second Steps." 38 *Judges' Journal* 4 (September 1999).

□ Recent Articles: Juries

Bornstein, Brian H. "The Ecological Validity of Jury Simulations: Is the Jury Still Out?" 23 *Law and Human Behavior* 75 (February 1999).

Cabot, Howard Ross and Christopher S. Coleman. "Arizona's 1995 Jury Reform Can Be Deemed a Success." 5 *Arizona Journal* 6 (July 12, 1999).

Guccione, Jean. "Study Recommends Letting Jurors Discuss Case Early On." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 1 (September 17, 1999).

Hans, Valerie P., Paula L. Hannaford,

and G. Thomas Munsterman. "The Arizona Jury Reform Permitting Civil Jury Trial Discussions: The Views of Trial Participants, Judges, and Jurors." 32 *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 349 (Winter 1999).

Harrington, Matthew P. "The Law-Finding Function of the American Jury." 1999 *Wisconsin Law Review* 377 (May-June 1999).

Harris, Michael D. "In L.A. Courts, Jurors Begin to Ask Questions: Innovative Program an Attempt to Improve the Quality of Jury Service." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 1 (August 23, 1999).

Hastie, Reid. "The Role of 'Stories' in Civil Jury Judgments." 32 *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 227 (Winter 1999).

Hersh, Adam. "Joint Criminal Trials with Multiple Juries: Why They Are Used and Suggested Ways to Implement Them." 73 *Florida Bar Journal* 72 (April 1999).

Horowitz, Mark R., Jay H. Tressler and Gregory C. Read. "National Jury Trial Innovations Project: an Update One Year Later." 66 *Defense Counsel Journal* 311 (July 1999).

"Jury Reform Proposals Become Law." 62 *Texas Bar Journal* 764 (September 1999).

King, Nancy Jean. "The American Criminal Jury." 62 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 41 (Spring 1999).

Klein, Kenneth S. and Theodore D. Klastorin. "Do Diverse Juries Aid or Impede Justice?" 1999 *Wisconsin Law Review* 553 (May-June 1999).

Kovera, Margaret Bull, Bradley D. McAuliff and Kellye S. Herbert. "Reasoning About Scientific Evidence: Effects on Juror Gender and Evidence Quality on Juror Decisions in a Hostile Work Environment Case." 84 *Journal of Applied Psychology* 362 (1999).

Landsman, Stephan. "The Civil Jury in America." 62 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 285 (Spring 1999).

Lempert, Richard. "Juries, Hindsight, and Punitive Damage Awards: Failures of a Social Science Case for Change (Response to Article by Reid Hastie and W. Kip Viscusi, Arizona Law Review, vol. 40, p. 901)." 48 *DePaul Law Review* 867 (Summer 1999).

Longhofer, Ronald S. "Jury Trial Techniques in Complex Civil Litigation." 32 *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 335 (Winter 1999).

McCoy, Monica L., Narina Nunez and Matthew M. Dammeyer. "The Effect of Jury Deliberations on Jurors' Reasoning Skills." 23 *Law and Human Behavior* 557 (October 1999).

Phillips, Annie King. "Creating a Seamless Transition from Jury Box to Jury Room for More Effective Decision Making." 32 *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 279 (Winter 1999).

Porter, Rebecca. "Jurors May Question Witnesses in Criminal Trials, Third Circuit Rules." 35 *Trial* 16 (August 1999).

Roemer, John. "S.F. Supervisor Pushes for Jury Reform." 112 *Los Angeles Daily Journal* 3 (March 16, 1999).

Schklar, Jason and Shari Seidman Diamond. "Juror Reactions to DNA Evidence: Errors and Expectancies." 23 *Law and Human Behavior* 159 (1999).

Schuck, Peter H. "Let's Streamline Voir Dire." 22 *National Law Journal* A21 (September 6, 1999).

Seltzer, Richard. "The Vanishing Juror: Why Are There Not Enough Available Jurors?" 20 *Justice System Journal* 203 (Spring 1999).

Vidmar, Neil. "The Canadian Criminal Jury: Searching for a Middle Ground." 62 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 141 (Spring 1999).

Wetherington, Gerald T., Hanson Lawton and Donald I. Pollock. "Preparing for the High Profile Case: an Omnibus Treatment for Judges and Lawyers." 51 *Florida Law Review* 425 (July 1999).

❑ "Did You Know?" Answers

1. Tony LaRussa, Branch Rike, Miller Huggins, Monte Ward, and Hugh Jennings.

2. The Yale Law Library.

3. Monopoly.

4. None of them attended law school.

5. Thomas Jefferson

From: Healey, Paul D. "De Minimis Curat Lex: A Compendium of Legal Trivia." 89 *Law Library Journal* 55 (1997).

❑ Contributors

Editor: Susan Armstrong

Sarah Andeen
Karen Anderson
Corinne Guthrie
Valerie Lerma
Richard Teenstra